6507809030

## RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 1 5 2008

Onyx Dkt No. 1047.DIV USSN: 10/669,768 PATENT

	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMI	SSION BY FACSIMILE (37 CFR 1.8)
I hereby certi	ify that this correspondence is being fac-	simile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents, United
States Patent	and Trademark Office, (Fax No. 571-27	73-8300) on the date indicated.
gan		15 July 2008
Signature		Date of Transmittal

In Re Application of: SHEN, Y., et al.	Confirmation No.: 8135
Serial No.: 10/669,768	Art Unit: 1633
Filing Date: 24 September 2003	Examiner: Marvich, M.

## RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the final Office Action in the above-referenced application, mailed 15 January 2008. The response date, with three-month extension, falls on Tuesday, 15 July 2008. Accordingly, the response date is 15 July 2008. A three-month extension of time to respond is requested, and a petition therefor accompanies this paper. Also accompanying this response is a Notice of Appeal. No additional fee is believed due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 15-0615 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.21 which may be required by this paper, with the exception of the payment of the issue fee. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Onyx Dkt No. 1047.DIV USSN: 10/669,768

PATENT

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

## **Introductory Comments**

## I. Summary of the Office Action.

JUL 1 5 2008

In the Office Action, mailed 15 January 2008, claims 11, 12, 24, 28, 33, 39 and 40 are rejected for the following reasons.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 24, 28, 33, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, asserting (i) that the specification, while being enabling for treatment of cancer characterized by p53 loss or deficiency by direct administration Onyx 051 and 053 (comprises a single amino acid substitution in amino acid 240 or 260), does not reasonably provide enablement for any other embodiment, and (ii) that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The Examiner indicated that this rejection was maintained for reasons of record in the Office Action mailed 9 May 2007.

This rejection is traversed for reasons discussed below.

Claims 13, 25 27 and 35 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See Office action, mailed 15 January 2008, page 8.